

09/107,979



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

PD

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/107,979 06/30/98 GODOWSKI

P P1084R1-2

EXAMINER

HM12/0811

ART UNIT/INSON PAPER NUMBER

6

GENENTECH INC
ATTN: DEIRDRE L CONLEY
1 DNA WAY
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080

1642

DATE MAILED: 08/11/99

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. Claims _____ are allowed.
4. Claims _____ are rejected.
5. Claims _____ are objected to.
6. Claims 1-38 are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a NRG3 polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - II. Claim 12, drawn to an antagonist, unclassified.
 - III. Claim 13, drawn to an agonist, unclassified.
 - IV. Claims 14-26, drawn to a polynucleotide, vectors and host cells comprising said polynucleotide and methods of recombinant expression of said polynucleotide, classified in classes 536 435, subclasses 23.1 and (252.3, 320.1 and 69.1).
 - V. Claims 27-28, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
 - VI. Claims 29-32, drawn to an immunoadhesin, classified in class 530, subclass 87.3.
 - VII. Claim 33, drawn to an antibody based detection method, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - VIII. Claims 34-36, drawn to a ligand based method of detection, classified in class 435 subclass 7.1.
 - IX. Claims 37-38, drawn to a gene therapy based method of treatment, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
Inventions of Groups I-VI are structurally and functionally different products which are made by different methods and have different uses. The examination of all groups would require different searches in the U.S. Patent Shoes and the scientific literature and would require the consideration of different patentability issues.
The methods of Groups VII-IX differ in the method objectives, method steps and parameters and in the reagents used.
Inventions I and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group I can be used in other methods, such as in methods of immunizing.

Inventions IV and IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotide of Group IV can be used in other methods, such as in hybridization based detection methods.

Inventions V and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody of group V can be used in other methods, such as in *in vivo* treatment methods.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter and because the searches required for the groups are not co-extensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.43). Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nancy Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 305-5860.



Nancy A. Johnson
Primary Examiner

August 10, 1999